

Appl. No. 10/538240
Reply to Action dated October 16, 2007
Page 5

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully request favorable reconsideration and reexamination of this application.

Claim 1 has been revised to include features of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 2-3 have been cancelled and claims 4-5 have been revised to track with the revision to claim 1.

Claims 9 and 11 have been revised editorially. Revision to claim 9 is supported by, for example, page 13, line 26 to page 14, line 11 and Figs. 1 and 3 in the Specification.

There is no new matter.

Claims 1 and 4-11 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 was objected to because it was considered to be unclear. Claim 9 has been revised editorially in response.

Claim 11 was objected to because the term "IC" was considered indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the term is indefinite. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the term "sensor IC chips" to mean "sensor integrated circuit chips." However, for clarification, claim 11 has been revised to address this objection.

Applicant respectfully requests a favorable reexamination of claims 9 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda et al. (US 5751386) in view of Shinohara et al. (US 7014349). Applicant does not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claim 1 has been revised to include the features of allowed claim 3 and its intermediate claim 2. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claim 9 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1 from which it depends. Applicant requests a favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda et al. (US 5751386) in view of Shinohara et al. (US 7014349) and further in view of Tai et al. (US

Appl. No. 10/538240
Reply to Action dated October 16, 2007
Page 6

5359691). Claim 2 has been cancelled making this rejection moot. Applicant does not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda et al. (US 5751386) in view of Shinohara et al. (US 7014349) and further in view of Oyama et al. (US 5808708). Applicant does not concede the correctness of the rejection. Claim 10 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1 from which it depends. Applicant requests a favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the claim.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: March 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ajk/tk